

MURDER WEAPON

1. Why don't we take a sentence or two and explain why the bullets fired from the revolver were smaller than the barrel. There is no way to tell from the Report now and an obvious question is raised as to why.

2. There is an unclear sentence in the middle of the third paragraph of this heading which states: "Also, the bullets were mutilated." Which ones?

3. The paragraph dealing with the number of shots fired and the manufacture of the cases and the slugs seems to me to be an exercise in pedantry, and possibly subject to error. Is it not possible that a Winchester-Western slug could have been fired from a Remington-Peters case? Even if not, why leave ourselves open to question when it does not really matter how many shots were fired, *as between 4 or 5.*

4. The last paragraph of this heading needs some footnotes, either in or out.

OWNERSHIP OF THE REVOLVER

1. The first sentence refers to "this type of revolver." I think it would be better to say "the type of revolver that was used to kill Patrolman Tippit."

OSWALD'S JACKET

1. The second paragraph of this heading needs some footnotes.

MURDER WEAPON

1. Why don't we take a sentence or two and explain why the bullets fired from the revolver were smaller than the barrel. There is no way to tell from the Report now and an obvious question is raised as to why.

2. There is an unclear sentence in the middle of the third paragraph of this heading which states: "Also, the bullets were mutilated." Which ones?

3. The paragraph dealing with the number of shots fired and the manufacture of the cases and the slugs seems to me to be an exercise in pedantry, and possibly subject to error. Is it not possible that a Winchester-Western slug could have been fired from a Remington-Peters case? Even if not, why leave ourselves open to question when it does not really matter how many shots were fired, as *between 4 or 5.*

4. The last paragraph of this heading needs some footnotes, either in or out.

OWNERSHIP OF THE REVOLVER

1. The first sentence refers to "this type of revolver." I think it would be better to say "the type of revolver that was used to kill Patrolman Tippit."

OSWALD'S JACKET

1. The second paragraph of this heading needs some footnotes.

11. - 1 recommended upturning of the
language in the report states the falsehood, that it
was Oswald's

Butler - The Brown story is implausible & should
have led to investigation of it. The 30 minutes in
8 blocks by a running man seen walking is still
in the Report. But, fortunately enough, he states
what Brown was doing in this time when there is
lost in my report - finding, let's see. Thus, I say
what was Brown really doing. He is recording
suspicions, in general about Brown - which
means a framing of Oswald.

2. There are inconsistencies in the description of Commission Exhibit 162. The same problem occurred above, when an exhibit was described sometimes as "Exhibit ____" and at others as "Commission Exhibit ____." A little thing, but why not do it right?

3. The conclusion to this heading reaches the crushing result that "Oswald disposed of his jacket as he fled from the scene of the Tippit killing." I submit that that is really not the conclusion we worked toward. Why not: "Those facts strongly support the finding that it was Lee Harvey Oswald who killed Patrolman Tippit and then fled through the parking lot adjoining Jefferson Boulevard, disposing of his jacket as he did so."

OSWALD'S ARREST

1. At first I was surprised to learn that Johnny Calvin Brewer knew that a patrolman had been shot when Oswald walked by his place of business, less than eight blocks from the point of the Tippit killing which Oswald apparently left as fast as he could.

2. Then I was surprised to learn that the police radio did not send out information about the suspect being in the Texas Theatre until 1:45, about 30 minutes after the police first learned of the Tippit killing from Benavides over Tippit's radio. What were Oswald and Brewer doing during this 30 minutes? Oswald was strangely inactive during this period, considering all that he had done in the 45 minutes following the assassination.

2. There are inconsistencies in the description of Commission Exhibit 162. The same problem occurred above, when an exhibit was described sometimes as "Exhibit ____" and at others as "Commission Exhibit ____." A little thing, but why not do it right?

3. The conclusion to this heading reaches the crushing result that "Oswald disposed of his jacket as he fled from the scene of the Tippit killing." I submit that that is really not the conclusion we worked toward. Why not: "Those facts strongly support the finding that it was Lee Harvey Oswald who killed Patrolman Tippit and then fled through the parking lot adjoining Jefferson Boulevard, disposing of his jacket as he did so."

OSWALD'S ARREST

1. At first I was surprised to learn that Johnny Calvin Brewer knew that a patrolman had been shot when Oswald walked by his place of business, less than eight blocks from the point of the Tippit killing which Oswald apparently left as fast as he could.

2. Then I was surprised to learn that the police radio did not send out information about the suspect being in the Torma Theatre until 1:45, about 30 minutes after the police first learned of the Tippit killing from Bonavides over Tippit's radio. What were Oswald and Brewer doing during this 30 minutes? Oswald was strangely inactive during this period, considering all that he had done in the 45 minutes following the assassination:

3. While I know that I will be thought mad to suggest that some editing be done on this chapter, consider the following sentence that appears on galley page 46: "As Oswald, handcuffed, was led from the theatre, he was, according to McDonald, "cursing a little bit and hollering police brutality." There are only 5 commas in that sentence. How about: ^{Tesch had that} ~~"According to McDonald,~~ Oswald was "cursing a little bit and hollering police brutality" as he was led handcuffed from the theatre."

4. Here compare the note above concerning page 36 that the police radio had noted the similarity of the descriptions between the man wanted for the assassination and the man wanted for the Tippit killing, by the time Oswald was arrested at the theatre. It could be, therefore, that some of the officers suspected that the man they were arresting was wanted in connection with the assassination.

STATEMENTS OF OSWALD DURING DETENTION

1. There are entirely too many subheadings under this general heading. None are really necessary. We reach the sublime when we have one whole heading for one short, four sentence paragraph. They should all be cut out and the whole discussion comprehended under the above general title.

2. In the paragraph on denial of rifle ownership appears the statement "small bore .22 rifle." That is redundant, since I presume we do not mean to distinguish from large bore .22 rifles. It should probably just read: ".22 calibre rifle."

3. The second to last sentence in that paragraph needs a footnote.

3. While I know that I will be thought mad to suggest that some editing be done on this chapter, consider the following sentence that appears on galley page 46: "As Oswald, handcuffed, was led from the theatre, he was, according to McDonald, "cursing a little bit and hollering police brutality." There are only 5 commas in that sentence. How about: ^{Tesch said that} ~~"According to McDonald,~~ Oswald was "cursing a little bit and hollering police brutality" as he was led handcuffed from the theatre."

4. Here compare the note above concerning page 36 that the police radio had noted the similarity of the descriptions between the man wanted for the assassination and the man wanted for the Tippit killing, by the time Oswald was arrested at the theatre. It could be, therefore, that some of the officers suspected that the man they were arresting was wanted in connection with the assassination.

STATEMENTS OF OSWALD DURING DETENTION

1. There are entirely too many subheadings under this general heading. None are really necessary. We reach the sublime when we have one whole heading for one short, four sentence paragraph. They should all be cut out and the whole discussion comprehended under the above general title.

2. In the paragraph on denial of rifle ownership appears the statement "small bore .22 rifle." That is redundant, since I presume we do not mean to distinguish from large bore .22 rifles. It should probably just read: ".22 calibre rifle."

3. The second to last sentence in that paragraph needs a section

17. His complaints about the section of the
Statements under investigation again in
mine & make a word of complaint. They
leave the major complaints: no word of Rome;
distinction of all original notes; Their direct
reported illegality, which denied possibility of their work
could have happened Donald